

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. [17-cv-05783-HSG](#)

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT-INTERVENOR'S MOTION TO INTERVENE**

Re: Dkt. No. 87

Pending before the Court is a motion to intervene filed by March for Life Education and Defense Fund (“March for Life”). Dkt. No. 87. In this case, the plaintiffs allege that certain federal agencies issued interim final rules (“IFRs”) in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”) and the United States Constitution. The IFRs, *inter alia*, created a moral exemption to the Affordable Care Act’s contraceptive mandate, which generally requires employers’ health insurance plans to cover all contraceptive methods approved by the Food and Drug Administration (“FDA”) without cost sharing on the part of employees. For the reasons set forth below, March for Life’s motion is **GRANTED**.

**I. BACKGROUND**

**A. March for Life Education and Defense Fund**

March for Life is a pro-life, non-religious organization located in Washington, D.C. Dkt. No. 87-1 (Decl. of Jeanne F. Mancini, or “Mancini Decl.”) ¶ 2. Founded in 1973 following the Supreme Court’s decision in *Roe v. Wade*, March for Life exists to “oppose abortion in all its forms” and “help all like-minded Americans to protect and advocate for the lives of unborn children.” *See id.* ¶¶ 3, 4, 5. The organization is non-profit and tax-exempt. *Id.* ¶ 2. It is this organization that brings the instant motion. March for Life represents that in accordance with its

1 underlying principles, it opposes the “destruction of human life at any stage before birth, including  
2 by abortifacient methods that may act after the union of a sperm and ovum.” *See id.* ¶¶ 11-12. As  
3 a matter of policy, March for Life only hires employees who are pro-life and share the  
4 organization’s basic moral convictions. *See id.* ¶ 8.

5 **B. The Regulatory Backdrop**

6 The Court briefly recounts the history of the contraceptive mandate as relevant to the IFR  
7 at issue in this case.<sup>1</sup> In 2010, Congress enacted the Affordable Care Act (“ACA”). The ACA  
8 included a provision that required health plans to cover certain forms of preventive care for  
9 women without cost sharing, as specified in guidelines provided by the Health Resources and  
10 Services Administration (“HRSA”), an agency of the U.S. Department of Health and Human  
11 Services (“HHS”). 42 U.S.C. § 300gg-13(a)(4). In 2011, HRSA issued those guidelines, which  
12 defined preventive care coverage to include all FDA-approved contraceptive methods.<sup>2</sup>

13 In 2012, in response to substantial public input, HHS, the U.S. Department of Labor, and  
14 the U.S. Department of the Treasury (“the agencies”) promulgated regulations exempting from the  
15 ACA’s contraceptive mandate certain religious employers who objected to providing  
16 contraceptive coverage. 77 Fed. Reg. 8,727. In 2013, the agencies promulgated rules establishing  
17 an accommodation, under which eligible organizations with religious objections to providing  
18 contraceptive coverage were “not required to contract, arrange, pay, or refer for [it],” but their  
19 “plan participants and beneficiaries . . . [would] still benefit from separate payments for  
20 contraceptive services without cost sharing or other charge,” as required by law. 78 Fed. Reg.  
21 39,874.

22 In 2014, the Supreme Court issued two opinions that affected the contours of the

---

23  
24 <sup>1</sup> The Court provided a more detailed history of the mandate and challenged IFRs in its Order  
Granting Plaintiffs’ Motion for a Preliminary Injunction. *See Dkt. No. 105 at 2-11.*

25 <sup>2</sup> *See* HEALTH RES. & SERVS. ADMIN., Women’s Preventive Services Guidelines, *available at*  
<https://www.hrsa.gov/womens-guidelines/index.html>. On December 20, 2016, HRSA updated the  
guidelines, clarifying that “[c]ontraceptive care should include contraceptive counseling, initiation  
of contraceptive use, and follow-up care,” as well as “enumerating the full range of contraceptive  
methods for women” as identified by the FDA. *See* HEALTH RES. & SERVS. ADMIN., Women’s  
Preventive Services Guidelines, *available at* <https://www.hrsa.gov/womens-guidelines-2016/index.html>.

1 exemption and accommodation. As a result of *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 134 S. Ct.  
2 2751 (2014), the agencies issued rules extending the exemption to closely-held entities with  
3 religious objections to providing contraceptive coverage. 80 Fed. Reg. 41,324. And as a result of  
4 *Wheaton College v. Burwell*, 134 S. Ct. 2806 (2014), the agencies issued a rule allowing  
5 organizations to trigger the accommodation process by providing the government notice of a  
6 religious objection using an alternative mechanism. 80 Fed. Reg. 41,323.

7 **C. March for Life’s Litigation**

8 In July 2014, March for Life (along with two of its employees) brought suit against the  
9 government in federal court, challenging the contraceptive mandate as violating the Constitution,  
10 the Religious Freedom and Restoration Act of 1993 (“RFRA”), and the Administrative Procedure  
11 Act (“APA”). *See March for Life v. Burwell*, 128 F. Supp. 3d 116, 123 (D.D.C. 2015). In  
12 September 2014, the plaintiffs moved for, *inter alia*, preliminary and permanent injunctive relief,  
13 which the district court consolidated and construed as a motion for summary judgment. *Id.* at 120.  
14 In August 2015, the court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the contraceptive  
15 mandate against March for Life, on the grounds that enforcement of that provision would violate  
16 the Equal Protection Clause of the Fifth Amendment, RFRA, and the APA. *Id.* at 134. In October  
17 2015, the federal government filed its notice of appeal, and the D.C. Circuit ordered the case be  
18 held in abeyance pending its decision in a similar case following the Supreme Court’s remand in  
19 *Zubik v. Burwell*, 136 S. Ct. 1557 (2016) (per curiam). Dkt. No. 87 at 11-12. March for Life’s  
20 case currently remains in abeyance pending further order by the D.C. Circuit. *Id.* at 12.

21 **D. The Zubik Case and Subsequent Impasse**

22 In May 2016, the Supreme Court issued its opinion in *Zubik*. The petitioners were  
23 primarily non-profit organizations, all of which were eligible for the religious accommodation but  
24 challenged the requirement that they submit notice to either their insurer or to the federal  
25 government as a violation of RFRA. *Zubik*, 136 S. Ct. at 1558. “Following oral argument, the  
26 Court requested supplemental briefing from the parties addressing ‘whether contraceptive  
27 coverage could be provided to petitioners’ employees, through petitioners’ insurance companies,  
28 without any such notice from petitioners.’” *Id.* at 1558-59. After the parties stated that “such an

1 option [was] feasible,” the Court remanded to afford them “an opportunity to arrive at an approach  
2 going forward that accommodates petitioners’ religious exercise while at the same time ensuring  
3 that women covered by petitioners’ health plans ‘receive full and equal health coverage, including  
4 contraceptive coverage.’” *Id.* at 1559. “The Court express[ed] no view on the merits of the  
5 cases,” and did not decide “whether petitioners’ religious exercise [had] been substantially  
6 burdened, whether the [g]overnment has a compelling interest, or whether the current regulations  
7 are the least restrictive means of serving that interest.” *Id.* at 1560. The litigation was then stayed.  
8

9 In July 2016, the agencies issued a request for information (“RFI”) on whether, in light of  
10 *Zubik*,

11 there are alternative ways (other than those offered in current  
12 regulations) for eligible organizations that object to providing  
coverage for contraceptive services on religious grounds to obtain an  
accommodation, while still ensuring that women enrolled in the  
organizations’ health plans have access to seamless coverage of the  
full range of [FDA]-approved contraceptives without cost sharing.  
13

14 81 Fed. Reg. 47,741. In January 2017, the agencies issued a document titled “FAQs About  
15 Affordable Care Act Implementation Part 36” (“FAQs”).<sup>3</sup> The FAQs stated that, based on the  
16 54,000 comments received in response to the RFI, there was “no feasible approach . . . at this time  
17 that would resolve the concerns of religious objectors, while still ensuring that the affected women  
18 receive full and equal health coverage, including contraceptive coverage.” FAQs at 4.  
19

#### E. The 2017 Interim Final Rules

20 On May 4, 2017, the President issued Executive Order No. 13,798, directing the agencies  
21 to “consider issuing amended regulations, consistent with applicable law, to address conscience-  
22 based objections to the preventive care mandate . . . .” 82 Fed. Reg. 21,675. Subsequently, on  
23 October 6, 2017, the agencies issued the Religious Exemption IFR and the Moral Exemption IFR  
24 at issue in this case, both of which were effective immediately. 82 Fed. Reg. 47,792.  
25

26 The Moral Exemption IFR, which is the IFR relevant to this motion, extended the  
27

---

28 <sup>3</sup> DEP’T OF LABOR, FAQS About Affordable Care Act Implementation Part 36, available at  
<https://www.dol.gov/sites/default/files/ebsa/about-ebsa/our-activities/resource-center/faqs/aca-part-36.pdf>.

1 protections afforded under the Religious Exemption<sup>4</sup> “to include additional entities and persons  
2 that object based on sincerely held moral convictions.” 82 Fed. Reg. 47,849. Additionally,  
3 “consistent with [their] expansion of the exemption, [the agencies] expand[ed] eligibility for the  
4 accommodation to include organizations with sincerely held moral convictions concerning  
5 contraceptive coverage,” while also making the accommodation process optional for those entities.

6 *Id.*

7 **F. Plaintiffs’ Challenge of the Interim Final Rules**

8 Plaintiffs in this case are the states of California, Delaware, Maryland, and New York, and  
9 the Commonwealth of Virginia. Defendants are HHS, Secretary of HHS Eric D. Hargan, the U.S.  
10 Department of Labor, Secretary of Labor R. Alexander Acosta, the U.S. Department of the  
11 Treasury, and Secretary of the Treasury Steven Mnuchin. Plaintiffs challenge the Religious  
12 Exemption and Moral Exemption IFRs, asserting that they violate the APA, the Establishment  
13 Clause, and the Equal Protection Clause.

14 On November 1, 2017, Plaintiffs filed the First Amended Complaint. Dkt. No. 24. On  
15 November 9, 2017, they moved for a preliminary injunction, seeking to prohibit implementation  
16 of the IFRs and require reinstatement of the previous exemption and accommodation regime,  
17 pending resolution on the merits. *See* Dkt. No. 28. The Court granted Plaintiffs’ motion for a  
18 preliminary injunction on December 21, 2017. Dkt. No. 105.

19 On November 21, 2017, the Little Sisters of the Poor Jeanne Jugan Residence (“the Little  
20 Sisters”) filed a motion to intervene. *See* Dkt. No. 38. The Court granted this motion on  
21 December 29, 2017. *See* Dkt. No. 115.

22 Meanwhile, March for Life filed this motion to intervene on December 8, 2017. Dkt. No.  
23 87 (“Mot.”). Plaintiffs filed their opposition on December 22, 2017, Dkt. No. 107, and March for  
24 Life replied on December 29, 2017, Dkt. No. 113. On January 17, 2018, March for Life requested

---

25  
26 <sup>4</sup> The Religious Exemption IFR substantially broadened the scope of the religious exemption,  
27 extending it “to encompass entities, and individuals, with sincerely held religious beliefs objecting  
28 to contraceptive or sterilization coverage,” and “making the accommodation process optional for  
eligible organizations.” 82 Fed. Reg. 47,807-08. Such entities “will not be required to comply  
with a self-certification process.” *Id.* at 47,808. Just as the IFR expanded eligibility for the  
exemption, it “likewise” expanded eligibility for the optional accommodation. *Id.* at 47,812-13.

1 that its motion to intervene be decided without a hearing. Dkt. No. 132.<sup>5</sup>

2 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

3 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(a) governs intervention as of right. The rule is  
4 “broadly interpreted in favor of intervention,” and requires a movant to show that

5 (1) the intervention application is timely; (2) the applicant has a  
6 significant protectable interest relating to the property or transaction  
7 that is the subject of the action; (3) the disposition of the action may,  
as a practical matter, impair or impede the applicant’s ability to  
protect its interest; and (4) the existing parties may not adequately  
represent the applicant’s interest.

8 *Citizens for Balanced Use v. Mont. Wilderness Ass’n*, 647 F.3d 893, 897 (9th Cir. 2011) (citing  
9 *Prete v. Bradbury*, 438 F.3d 949, 954 (9th Cir. 2006)). Courts deciding motions to intervene as of  
10 right are “guided primarily by practical considerations, not technical distinctions.” *See id.*  
11 (quoting *Sw. Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Berg*, 268 F.3d 810, 818 (9th Cir. 2001)); *see also*  
12 *U.S. v. City of L.A.*, 288 F.3d 391, 397 (9th Cir. 2002) (stating that “equitable considerations”  
13 guide determination of motions to intervene as of right) (citation omitted).

14 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(b) governs permissive intervention. The Ninth Circuit  
15 has interpreted the rule to allow permissive intervention “where the applicant for intervention  
16 shows (1) independent grounds for jurisdiction; (2) the motion is timely; and (3) the applicant’s  
17 claim or defense, and the main action, have a question of law or a question of fact in common.”  
18 *City of L.A.*, 288 F.3d at 403 (quoting *Nw. Forest Res. Council v. Glickman*, 82 F.3d 825, 839 (9th  
19 Cir. 1996)). “In exercising its discretion” on this issue, “the court must consider whether the  
20 intervention will unduly delay or prejudice the adjudication of the original parties’ rights.” Fed.  
21 R. Civ. P. 24(b)(3).

22 **III. DISCUSSION**

23 March for Life argues that it is entitled to intervention as of right, or in the alternative, to  
24 permissive intervention. At the core of its argument is the claim that this lawsuit “threatens to  
25 undo the protections contained” in the Moral Exemption IFR and “produce a ruling that

---

26  
27  
28 <sup>5</sup> The Court agrees that this matter is appropriate for disposition without oral argument and the  
matter is deemed submitted. *See* Civil L.R. 7-1(b).

1 contradicts the injunctive relief” March for Life has “already secured.” Mot. at 1-2. As such, it  
2 seeks intervention to defend what it characterizes as “its right to operate its organization in a  
3 manner consistent with its moral convictions and its reason for being, free from the imposition of  
4 potentially crippling fines.” *See id.* at 1.

5 While March for Life’s basis for seeking intervention is different from the Little Sisters’,  
6 the controlling legal analysis is identical. Accordingly, the Court incorporates by reference the  
7 analysis in its order granting the Little Sisters’ motion to intervene, and finds that March for Life  
8 is not entitled to intervention as of right because it cannot overcome the presumption that the  
9 government will adequately represent its interest with regard to the Moral Exemption IFR. *See*  
10 Dkt. No. 115 at 7-14. As with the Little Sisters, however, permissive intervention is appropriate  
11 under these circumstances. *See* Dkt. No. 115 at 14-15.

12 **IV. CONCLUSION**

13 For the foregoing reasons, permissive intervention (but not intervention as of right) is  
14 warranted. March for Life’s motion to intervene is therefore **GRANTED**. This terminates Docket  
15 Number 132 as moot.

16 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

17 Dated: 1/26/2018

18   
19 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.  
20 United States District Judge

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28